

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 13 and 15-17 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 13-17 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### Non-Prior Art Rejections:

On page 2, claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The claims have been amended in response thereto, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The changes in the wording of the body of claims 16 and 17 are not made for purposes of patentability, but to be consistent with the amended preamble.

### Prior Art Rejections:

The Office Action, at pages 2-4, rejected claims 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Shiman et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/019827), Prompt (U.S. Patent 6,985,905) and Voticky (U.S. Patent 6,351,764). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Shiman et al. teaches in paragraph [0157], at lines 11-17:

The complete set of all applicable permutations of e-mail object sorting methods is: by date, by subject, by author, by author then subject, by subject then author, by subject then date, by author then date, by author then subject then date, and by subject then author then date. Typically, the date is used as a final sorting order.

Thus, Shiman et al. teaches a sorting method using date, subject and author or any permutation thereof. What is not taught by Shiman et al. is a sorting method or unit that sorts:

e-mail messages into a hierarchical structure according to a user selectable parent-child attribute and the sender address, each comprising a plurality of labels representing different levels of domain names, where the first label refers to a lowest level sub-domain and the last label refers to a top-level domain, and the sorting unit follows the hierarchical structure of the domain name by referring to the labels in reverse order that the label appear in the sender address

(e.g., claim 13 at lines 3-8) as recited in the independent claims. Furthermore, nothing has been cited in Prompt or Voticky that teaches or suggests sorting in the manner recited in the claims.

Therefore it is submitted that independent claims 13 and 15-17, and dependent claims 14 and 15 that depend therefrom, are patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record.

**Request for Examiner Interview:**

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to arrange an Examiner Interview before action on this Amendment is taken.

**Summary:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 8/7/07

By: David E. Moore  
David E. Moore  
Registration No. 59,047

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501